

QUANTUM TORSORS AND HOPF-GALOIS OBJECTS

PETER SCHAUENBURG

ABSTRACT. We prove that every faithfully flat Hopf-Galois object is a quantum torsor in the sense of Grunspan.

1. INTRODUCTION

The main result of this short note is to complete the comparison between the notion of a quantum torsor recently introduced by Grunspan [3], and the older notion of a Hopf-Galois object.

An H -Galois object for a k -Hopf algebra H is a right H -comodule algebra A whose coinvariant subalgebra is the base ring k and for which the canonical map

$$\beta := \left(A \otimes A \xrightarrow{A \otimes \rho} A \otimes A \otimes H \xrightarrow{\nabla \otimes H} A \otimes H \right)$$

is a bijection (where ∇ is the multiplication map of A , and $\rho: A \rightarrow A \otimes H$ is the coaction of H on A). The notion appears in this generality in [4]; we refer to Montgomery's book [5] for background. If one specializes A and H to be affine commutative algebras, then they correspond to an affine scheme and an affine group scheme, respectively, and the definition recovers the definition of a G -torsor with structure group $G = \text{Spec}(H)$, in other words the affine algebraic version of a principal fiber bundle.

In Grunspan's definition a quantum torsor is an algebra T equipped with certain structure maps $\mu: T \rightarrow T \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes T$ and $\theta: T \rightarrow T$ which are required to fulfill a set of axioms that we shall recall below. The definition is also inspired by results in classical algebraic geometry, going back to work of Baer [1]; we refer to [3] for more literature. Notably, if we again specify T to be an affine commutative algebra, then the definition (which now does not need the map θ) is known to characterize torsors, without requiring any prior specification of a structure group; in fact two structure groups can be constructed from the torsor rather than having to be given in advance. In addition to being group-free, this characterization has advantages when additional structures, notably Poisson structures, come into play: In the latter situation one cannot expect the canonical map β in the definition of a Hopf-Galois extension to be maps of Poisson algebras, while the structure maps of a torsor are; thus the definition of a Poisson torsor becomes more natural when given in the group-free form.

Generalizing the results on commutative torsors, Grunspan shows that any torsor T in the sense of his definition has the structure of an L - H -bi-Galois extension for two naturally constructed Hopf algebras $L = H_l(T)$ and $H = H_r(T)$. Thus, as in the commutative case, a torsor is a quantum group-free way to define a quantum

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16W30.

Key words and phrases. Hopf algebra, Hopf-Galois extension, Torsor.

principal homogeneous space (with trivial base), with quantum structure group(s) that can be constructed afterwards.

The following natural question is left open (or rather, asked explicitly) in [3]: Are there Hopf-Galois objects that do not arise from quantum torsors? Or, on the contrary, does every Hopf-Galois object have a quantum torsor structure?

We shall prove the latter (under the mild assumptions that Hopf algebras should have bijective antipodes, and Hopf-Galois objects should be faithfully flat). Thus Grunspan's quantum torsors are seen to be an equivalent characterization of Hopf-(bi)-Galois objects, without reference to the Hopf algebras involved, parallel to the commutative case. On the other hand, the group $\text{Tor}(H)$ of quantum torsors associated to a Hopf algebra H in [3] coincides with the group $\text{BiGal}(H, H)$ of H - H -bi-Galois objects introduced in [6].

2. NOTATIONS

Throughout the paper, we work over a commutative base ring k .

We denote multiplication in an algebra A by $\nabla = \nabla_A$, and comultiplication in a coalgebra C by $\Delta = \Delta_C$; we will write $\Delta(c) =: c_{(1)} \otimes c_{(2)}$. We will write $\rho: V \rightarrow V \otimes C$ for the structure map of a right C -comodule V , and $\rho(v) =: v_{(0)} \otimes v_{(1)}$.

Let H be a k -(faithfully) flat k -Hopf algebra, with antipode S . A right H -comodule algebra T is an algebra T which is a right H -comodule whose structure map $\rho: T \rightarrow T \otimes H$ is an algebra map. We say that T is an H -Galois extension of its coinvariant subalgebra $T^{\text{co}H} := \{t \in T \mid \rho(t) = t \otimes 1\}$ if the canonical map $\beta: T \otimes_{T^{\text{co}H}} T \rightarrow T \otimes H$ given by $\beta(x \otimes y) = xy_{(0)} \otimes y_{(1)}$ is a bijection. We will call an H -Galois extension T whose coinvariant subalgebra is the base ring an H -Galois object for short. In most of this paper we will be interested in faithfully flat (i.e. faithfully flat as k -module) H -Galois objects. For an H -Galois object T , we define $\gamma: H \rightarrow T \otimes T$ by $\gamma(h) := \beta^{-1}(1 \otimes h)$, and write $\gamma(h) =: h^{[1]} \otimes h^{[2]}$. The following facts on γ can be found in [8]: For all $x \in T$, $g, h \in H$ we have

$$(2.1) \quad x_{(0)}x_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[2]} = 1 \otimes x$$

$$(2.2) \quad h^{[1]}h^{[2]} = \varepsilon(h) \cdot 1$$

$$(2.3) \quad h^{[1]} \otimes h^{[2]}_{(0)} \otimes h^{[2]}_{(1)} = h_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes h_{(1)}^{[2]} \otimes h_{(2)}$$

$$(2.4) \quad h^{[1]}_{(0)} \otimes h^{[2]} \otimes h^{[1]}_{(1)} = h_{(2)}^{[1]} \otimes h_{(2)}^{[2]} \otimes S(h_{(1)})$$

$$(2.5) \quad (gh)^{[1]} \otimes (gh)^{[2]} = h^{[1]}g^{[1]} \otimes g^{[2]}h^{[2]}$$

$$(2.6) \quad 1^{[1]} \otimes 1^{[2]} = 1 \otimes 1$$

In particular, the last two equations say that $\gamma: H \rightarrow T^{\text{op}} \otimes T$ is an algebra map.

We now recall Grunspan's definition of a quantum torsor [3]: A quantum torsor $(T, \nabla, 1, \mu, \theta)$ consists of a faithfully flat k -algebra $(T, \nabla, 1)$, an algebra map $\mu: T \rightarrow T \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes T$, and an algebra automorphism $\theta: T \rightarrow T$ satisfying, for all $x \in T$:

$$(2.7) \quad (T \otimes \nabla)\mu(x) = x \otimes 1$$

$$(2.8) \quad (\nabla \otimes T)\mu(x) = 1 \otimes x$$

$$(2.9) \quad (T \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes \mu)\mu = (\mu \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes T)\mu$$

$$(2.10) \quad (T \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes \theta \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes T)(\mu \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes T)\mu = (T \otimes \mu^{\text{op}} \otimes T)\mu$$

$$(2.11) \quad (\theta \otimes \theta \otimes \theta)\mu = \mu\theta,$$

where $\mu^{\text{op}}: T^{\text{op}} \rightarrow T^{\text{op}} \otimes T \otimes T^{\text{op}}$ is defined by $\mu^{\text{op}} = \tau_{(13)}\mu$, and $\tau_{(13)}$ exchanges the first and last tensor factor in $T \otimes T \otimes T$. We will also write T or (T, μ, θ) for $(T, \nabla, 1, \mu, \theta)$, if the structure maps, or at least the algebra structure maps, are clear from the context. What we have defined above is what is called a k -torsor in [3], where more generally the notion of an A -torsor is defined for every k -algebra A . However, after extending scalars from k to A , the notion of an A -torsor is covered by the above definition, which is therefore sufficient for our purposes.

3. THE MAIN RESULT

We shall show that every faithfully flat H -Galois object T is a quantum torsor. To prepare, we shall show that certain elements in $T \otimes T$ and $T \otimes T \otimes T$ which shall occur in our calculations can be written with the rightmost tensor factors taken to be scalars, or equivalently H -coinvariant elements:

Lemma 3.1. *Let T be a faithfully flat H -Galois object. Then*

$$(3.1) \quad S(x_{(1)})^{[1]} \otimes x_{(0)} S(x_{(1)})^{[2]} \in T \otimes k \subset T \otimes T$$

for all $x \in T$, and

$$(3.2) \quad h_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes S(h_{(2)})^{[1]} \otimes h_{(1)}^{[2]} S(h_{(2)})^{[2]} \in T \otimes T \otimes k \subset T \otimes T \otimes T$$

for all $h \in H$.

Proof. For $x \in T$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & S(x_{(1)})^{[1]} \otimes \rho(x_{(0)} S(x_{(1)})^{[2]}) \\ &= S(x_{(2)})^{[1]} \otimes x_{(0)} S(x_{(2)})^{[2]}_{(0)} \otimes x_{(1)} S(x_{(2)})^{[2]}_{(1)} \\ &\stackrel{(2.3)}{=} S(x_{(2)})_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes x_{(0)} S(x_{(2)})_{(1)}^{[2]} \otimes x_{(1)} S(x_{(2)})_{(2)} \\ &= S(x_{(3)})^{[1]} \otimes x_{(0)} S(x_{(3)})^{[2]} \otimes x_{(1)} S(x_{(2)}) \\ &= S(x_{(1)})^{[1]} \otimes x_{(0)} S(x_{(1)})^{[2]} \otimes 1 \end{aligned}$$

in $T \otimes T \otimes H$. Since $T^{\text{co}H} = k$ and T is flat over k , this proves the first claim.

Similarly, for $h \in H$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & h_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes S(h_{(2)})^{[1]} \otimes \rho(h_{(1)}^{[2]} S(h_{(2)})^{[2]}) \\ &\stackrel{(2.3)}{=} h_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes S(h_{(3)})_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes h_{(1)}^{[2]} S(h_{(3)})_{(1)}^{[2]} \otimes h_{(2)} S(h_{(3)})_{(2)} \\ &= h_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes S(h_{(4)})^{[1]} \otimes h_{(1)}^{[2]} S(h_{(4)})^{[2]} \otimes h_{(2)} S(h_{(3)}) \\ &= h_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes S(h_{(2)})^{[1]} \otimes h_{(1)}^{[2]} S(h_{(2)})^{[2]} \otimes 1, \end{aligned}$$

proving the second claim, again by flatness of T . $\square$

Abusing Sweedler notation, the Lemma says that the “elements” $x_{(0)} S(x_{(1)})^{[2]}$ and $h_{(1)}^{[2]} S(h_{(2)})^{[2]}$ are scalars. We will use this by moving these elements around freely in any k -multilinear expression in calculations below, sometimes indicating our plans by putting parentheses around the “scalar” before moving it.

Theorem 3.2. *Let T be a faithfully flat H -Galois object, where H is a Hopf algebra with bijective antipode. Then (T, μ, θ) is a quantum torsor, with*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(x) &= (T \otimes \gamma)\rho(x) = x_{(0)} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[2]} \\ \theta(x) &= (x_{(0)} S(x_{(1)})^{[2]}) S(x_{(1)})^{[1]} = S(x_{(1)})^{[1]} (x_{(0)} S(x_{(1)})^{[2]}) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For all calculations, we let $x, y \in T$ and $h \in H$.

Since ρ and γ are algebra maps, so is μ . We have

$$(T \otimes \nabla)\mu(x) = x_{(0)} \otimes \nabla\gamma(x_{(1)}) = x_{(0)} \otimes \varepsilon(x_{(1)})1 = x \otimes 1$$

by (2.2), and $(\nabla \otimes T)\mu(x) = x_{(0)}x_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[2]} = 1 \otimes x$ by (2.1). Next

$$\begin{aligned} (T \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes \mu)\mu(x) &= x_{(0)} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes \mu(x_{(1)}^{[2]}) \\ &= x_{(0)} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[2]}_{(0)} \otimes \gamma(x_{(1)}^{[2]}_{(1)}) \\ &\stackrel{(2.3)}{=} x_{(0)} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[2]} \otimes \gamma(x_{(2)}) \\ &= \mu(x_{(0)}) \otimes \gamma(x_{(1)}) \\ &= (\mu \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes T)\mu(x) \end{aligned}$$

proves (2.9). It is clear that $\theta(1) = 1$. For $x, y \in T$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(xy) &= x_{(0)}y_{(0)}S(x_{(1)}y_{(1)})^{[2]}S(x_{(1)}y_{(1)})^{[1]} \\ &= x_{(0)}y_{(0)}(S(y_{(1)})S(x_{(1)}))^{[2]}(S(y_{(1)})S(x_{(1)}))^{[1]} \\ &\stackrel{(2.5)}{=} x_{(0)}(y_{(0)}S(y_{(1)})^{[2]})S(x_{(1)})^{[2]}S(x_{(1)})^{[1]}S(y_{(1)})^{[1]} \\ &\stackrel{(3.1)}{=} x_{(0)}S(x_{(1)})^{[2]}S(x_{(1)})^{[1]}(y_{(0)}S(y_{(1)})^{[2]})S(y_{(1)})^{[1]} \\ &= \theta(x)\theta(y), \end{aligned}$$

so θ is an algebra map.

For $h \in H$ we have

$$(3.3) \quad h^{[1]} \otimes \theta(h^{[2]}) = S(h)^{[2]} \otimes S(h)^{[1]}$$

by the calculation

$$\begin{aligned} h^{[1]} \otimes \theta(h^{[2]}) &= h^{[1]} \otimes h^{[2]}_{(0)}S(h^{[2]}_{(1)})^{[2]}S(h^{[2]}_{(1)})^{[1]} \\ &\stackrel{(2.3)}{=} h_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes (h_{(1)}^{[2]}S(h_{(2)})^{[2]})S(h_{(2)})^{[1]} \\ &\stackrel{(3.2)}{=} h_{(1)}^{[1]}(h_{(1)}^{[2]}S(h_{(2)})^{[2]}) \otimes S(h_{(2)})^{[2]} \\ &\stackrel{(2.2)}{=} S(h)^{[2]} \otimes S(h)^{[1]}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$(T \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes \theta)\mu(x) = x_{(0)} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes \theta(x_{(1)}^{[2]}) \stackrel{(3.3)}{=} x_{(0)} \otimes S(x_{(1)})^{[2]} \otimes S(x_{(1)})^{[1]},$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned} (T \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes \theta \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes T)(\mu \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes T)\mu(x) \\ &= (T \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes \theta)\mu(x_{(0)}) \otimes \gamma(x_{(1)}) \\ &= x_{(0)} \otimes S(x_{(1)})^{[2]} \otimes S(x_{(1)})^{[1]} \otimes \gamma(x_{(2)}), \end{aligned}$$

and on the other hand

$$\begin{aligned} (T \otimes \mu^{\text{op}} \otimes T)\mu(x) &= x_{(0)} \otimes \mu^{\text{op}}(x_{(1)}^{[1]}) \otimes x_{(1)}^{[2]} \\ &= x_{(0)} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[1]}_{(1)}^{[2]} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[1]}_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[1]}_{(0)} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[2]} \\ &\stackrel{(2.4)}{=} x_{(0)} \otimes S(x_{(1)})^{[2]} \otimes S(x_{(1)})^{[1]} \otimes x_{(2)}^{[1]} \otimes x_{(2)}^{[2]}, \end{aligned}$$

proving (2.10). To prove (2.11) we first check

$$(3.4) \quad \rho\theta(x) = \theta(x_{(0)}) \otimes S^2(x_{(1)}),$$

by the calculation

$$\begin{aligned} \rho\theta(x) &\stackrel{(3.1)}{=} (x_{(0)}S(x_{(1)})^{[2]})\rho(S(x_{(1)})^{[1]}) \\ &\stackrel{(2.4)}{=} x_{(0)}S(x_{(1)})_{(2)}^{[2]}S(x_{(1)})_{(2)}^{[1]} \otimes S(S(x_{(1)})_{(1)}) \\ &= x_{(0)}S(x_{(1)})^{[2]}S(x_{(1)})^{[1]} \otimes S^2(x_{(2)}) \\ &= \theta(x_{(0)}) \otimes S^2(x_{(2)}). \end{aligned}$$

Using this, we find

$$\begin{aligned} (\theta \otimes \theta \otimes \theta)\mu(x) &= \theta(x_{(0)}) \otimes \theta(x_{(1)})^{[1]} \otimes \theta(x_{(1)})^{[2]} \\ &\stackrel{(3.3)}{=} \theta(x_{(0)}) \otimes \theta(S(x_{(1)})^{[2]}) \otimes S(x_{(1)})^{[1]} \\ &\stackrel{(3.3)}{=} \theta(x_{(0)}) \otimes S^2(x_{(1)})^{[1]} \otimes S^2(x_{(1)})^{[2]} \\ &= \theta(x_{(0)}) \otimes \gamma(S^2(x_{(1)})) \\ &\stackrel{(3.4)}{=} \theta(x)_{(0)} \otimes \gamma(\theta(x)_{(1)}) = \mu\theta(x). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to check that θ is a bijection. Now we have seen that θ is an algebra map, and colinear, provided that the codomain copy of T is endowed with the comodule structure restricted along the Hopf algebra automorphism S^2 of H . Of course T with this new comodule algebra structure is also H -Galois. It is known [7, Rem.3.11.(1)] that every comodule algebra homomorphism between nonzero H -Galois objects is a bijection. $\square$

Remark 3.3. *Obviously, if we drop the requirement that θ be bijective from the definition of a quantum torsor, we can do without bijectivity of the antipode of H in the proof. More precisely, the proof shows that θ is bijective if and only if S is.*

By the results of Grunspan, any quantum torsor T has associated to it two Hopf algebras $H_l(T)$ and $H_r(T)$, which make it into an $H_l(T)$ - $H_r(T)$ -bi-Galois object in the sense of [6]. That is, T is a right $H_r(T)$ -Galois object in the sense recalled above, and at the same time a left $H_l(T)$ -Galois object (i.e. the same as a right Galois object, with sides switched in the definition), in such a way that the two comodule structures involved make it into an $H_l(T)$ - $H_r(T)$ -bicomodule. Together with these constructions, Theorem 3.2 shows that the notions of a quantum torsor and of a Hopf-bi-Galois extension are equivalent, provided that we complete the picture by proving the following:

Proposition 3.4. 1. *Let T be a faithfully flat H -Galois object, and consider the torsor associated to it as in Theorem 3.2. Then $H_r(T) \cong H$, and $H_l(T) \cong L(T, H)$, where the latter is the Hopf algebra making T an $L(T, H)$ - H -bi-Galois object, see [6].*
 2. *Let T be a quantum torsor. Then the quantum torsor associated as in Theorem 3.2 to the $H_r(T)$ -Galois object T coincides with T .*

Proof. By the results in [6], each of the two one-sided Hopf-Galois structures in an L - H -bi-Galois object determines the other (along with the other Hopf algebra). Thus to prove (1), it suffices to check that $L(T, H) \cong H_l(T)$, and the isomorphism

is compatible with the left coactions. Now let $\xi \in T \otimes T^{\text{op}}$. We write formally $\xi = x \otimes y$ even though we do not assume ξ to be a decomposable tensor. According to the definition of $H_l(T) \subset T \otimes T^{\text{op}}$ in [3], we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi \in H_l(T) &\Leftrightarrow (T \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes T \otimes \theta)\mu(x) \otimes y = x \otimes \mu^{\text{op}}(y) \\
&\Leftrightarrow x_{(0)} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes \theta(x_{(1)}^{[2]}) \otimes y = x \otimes \mu^{\text{op}}(y) \\
&\stackrel{(3.3)}{\Leftrightarrow} x_{(0)} \otimes S(x_{(1)})^{[2]} \otimes S(x_{(1)})^{[1]} \otimes y = x \otimes y_{(1)}^{[2]} \otimes y_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes y_{(0)} \\
&\Leftrightarrow x_{(0)} \otimes S(x_{(1)}) \otimes y = x \otimes y_{(1)} \otimes y_{(0)} \\
&\Leftrightarrow \xi \in (T \otimes T)^{\text{co } H}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step $T \otimes T$ is endowed with the codiagonal comodule structure, and we have used a version of [7, Lem.3.1]. By the definition of $L(T, H)$ in [6], this shows $L(T, H) = H_\ell(T)$ as algebras. A look at the respective definitions of comultiplication in $L(T, H)$ and $H_\ell(T)$ and of their coactions on T shows that these also agree.

To show (2), we use the following results on $H_r(T)$ from [3]: $H_r(T)$ is some subalgebra of $T^{\text{op}} \otimes T$, the right $H_r(T)$ -comodule algebra structure of T maps $x \in T$ to $x_{(0)} \otimes x_{(1)} := \mu(x) \in T \otimes H_r(T) \subset T \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes T$, and T is in fact $H_r(T)$ -Galois, that is, the canonical map $\beta: T \otimes T \rightarrow T \otimes H$ is bijective. Now the torsor structure (T, μ', θ') induced on T by its Hopf-Galois structure as in Theorem 3.2 satisfies $\mu'(x) = x_{(0)} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[2]}$. To check $\mu = \mu'$, we apply β to the two right tensor factors. Writing $\mu(x) := x^{(1)} \otimes x^{(2)} \otimes x^{(3)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(T \otimes \beta)\mu(x) &= x^{(1)} \otimes \beta(x^{(2)} \otimes x^{(3)}) \\
&= x^{(1)} \otimes x^{(2)}x^{(3)}_{(0)} \otimes x^{(3)}_{(1)} \\
&= x^{(1)} \otimes x^{(2)}x^{(3)(1)} \otimes x^{(3)(2)} \otimes x^{(3)(3)} \\
&\stackrel{(2.9)}{=} x^{(1)(1)} \otimes x^{(1)(2)}x^{(1)(3)} \otimes x^{(2)} \otimes x^{(3)} \\
&\stackrel{(2.7)}{=} x^{(1)} \otimes 1 \otimes x^{(2)} \otimes x^{(3)} \\
&= x_{(0)} \otimes 1 \otimes x^{(1)} \\
&= x_{(0)} \otimes \beta(x_{(1)}^{[1]} \otimes x_{(1)}^{[2]}) \\
&= (T \otimes \beta)\mu'(x)
\end{aligned}$$

Since θ is determined by μ , we are done. $\square$

As a result of the Proposition, the construction $L(T, H)$ for a Hopf-Galois object T coincides with the construction of $H_l(T)$ as in [3] for the quantum torsor associated to the Hopf-Galois object T as in Theorem 3.2. Finally

Corollary 3.5. *The group $\text{Tor}(H)$ of isomorphism classes of quantum torsors T equipped with specified isomorphisms $H \cong H_l(T) \cong H_r(T)$ was observed by Grunspan to be a subgroup of the group $\text{BiGal}(H)$ of H - H -bi-Galois objects defined in [6]. We see that the two groups in fact coincide.*

4. RIBBON TRANSFORMATIONS AND THE MIYASHITA-ULBRICH ACTION

The proof we gave for Theorem 3.2 is rather direct. One can shorten it slightly, and perhaps provide some partial explanation for the behavior of the θ map by using

the Miyashita-Ulbrich action [10, 2] and the notion of a ribbon transformation of monoidal functors introduced by Sommerhäuser [9]. To discuss this, we assume again that H has bijective antipode.

Recall that a right-right Yetter-Drinfeld module $V \in \mathcal{YD}_H^H$ is a right H -module (with action denoted $\leftarrow$) and H -comodule such that

$$v_{(0)} \leftarrow h_{(1)} \otimes v_{(1)} h_{(2)} = (v \leftarrow h_{(2)})_{(0)} \otimes h_{(1)} (v \leftarrow h_{(2)})_{(1)},$$

or equivalently $\rho(v \leftarrow h) = v_{(0)} \leftarrow h_{(2)} \otimes S(h_{(1)}) v_{(1)} h_{(2)}$ holds for all $v \in V$. The category $\mathcal{YD}_H^H$ is a braided monoidal category. The tensor product of Yetter-Drinfeld modules is their tensor product over k with the (co)diagonal action and coaction, the braiding σ is given by

$$\sigma_{VW}: V \otimes W \ni v \otimes w \mapsto w_{(0)} \otimes v \leftarrow w_{(1)} \in W \otimes V$$

for $V, W \in \mathcal{YD}_H^H$, its inverse by $\sigma_{VW}^{-1}(w \otimes v) = v \leftarrow S^{-1}(w_{(1)}) \otimes w_{(0)}$.

Let T be a faithfully flat H -Galois object. The Miyashita-Ulbrich action of H on T is defined by $x \leftarrow h := h^{[1]} x h^{[2]}$ for $x \in T$ and $h \in H$. It is proved in [10, 2] (without the terminology) that T with its H -comodule structure and the Miyashita-Ulbrich action is a Yetter-Drinfeld module algebra, that is, an algebra in $\mathcal{YD}_H^H$. This means that it is a module algebra (it is a comodule algebra to begin with), and a Yetter-Drinfeld module. Moreover, T is commutative in the braided monoidal category $\mathcal{YD}_H^H$, which means that we have $\nabla \sigma_{TT} = \nabla$, that is $xy = y_{(0)}(x \leftarrow y_{(1)})$ for all $x, y \in T$.

An endofunctor F of $\mathcal{YD}_H^H$ is defined by letting $F(V)$ be the k -module V , equipped with the new right coaction $v \mapsto v_{(0)} \otimes S^{-2}(v_{(1)})$ and right action $v \otimes h \mapsto v \leftarrow S^2(h)$. The functor F preserves the tensor product as well as the braiding of $\mathcal{YD}_H^H$.

According to Sommerhäuser, a ribbon transformation $\theta: Id \rightarrow F$ is a natural transformation such that $\theta_V \otimes \theta_W = \theta_{V \otimes W} \sigma_{WV} \sigma_{VW}$ holds for all $V, W \in \mathcal{YD}_H^H$ (moreover, we should have $\theta_k = id_k$). The example of a ribbon transformation we will use is essentially in [9], up to a switch of sides. It generalizes the map θ in the proof of Theorem 3.2, and is defined by $\theta_V(v) = v_{(0)} \leftarrow S(v_{(1)})$ for $V \in \mathcal{YD}_H^H$ and $v \in V$. This is surely natural, and also a morphism in $\mathcal{YD}_H^H$, that is, H -linear and H -colinear according to the formulas

$$\rho \theta_V(v) = \theta_V(v_{(0)}) \otimes S^2(v_{(1)}) \quad \theta_V(v) \leftarrow h = \theta_V(v \leftarrow S^{-2}(h)),$$

the first of which was used in our proof of Theorem 3.2; we'll omit the proofs. Since for all $v \in V \in \mathcal{YD}_H^H$ and $w \in W \in \mathcal{YD}_H^H$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{W \otimes V} \sigma(v \otimes w) &= \sigma(v \otimes w)_{(0)} \leftarrow S(\sigma(v \otimes w)) \\ &= \sigma((v \otimes w)_{(0)}) \leftarrow S((v \otimes w)_{(1)}) \\ &= (w_{(0)} \otimes v_{(0)} \leftarrow w_{(1)}) \leftarrow S(v_{(1)} w_{(2)}) \\ &= w_{(0)} \leftarrow S(v_{(2)} w_{(3)}) \otimes v_{(0)} \leftarrow w_{(1)} S(v_{(1)} w_{(2)}) \\ &= w_{(0)} \leftarrow S(v_{(2)} w_{(1)}) \otimes v_{(0)} \leftarrow S(v_{(1)}) \\ &= \theta(w) \leftarrow S(v_{(1)}) \otimes \theta(v_{(0)}) \\ &= \theta(w \leftarrow S^{-1}(v_{(1)})) \otimes \theta(v_{(0)}) \\ &= (\theta_W \otimes \theta_V) \sigma^{-1}(v \otimes w), \end{aligned}$$

θ is a ribbon transformation.

Given the results on the ribbon transformation θ (which we could have taken by side-switching from [9]), it is almost obvious that θ_T is an algebra map: $\theta_T \nabla = \nabla \theta_{T \otimes T} = \nabla(\theta_T \otimes \theta_T) \sigma^{-2} = \nabla \sigma^{-2}(\theta_T \otimes \theta_T) = \nabla(\theta_T \otimes \theta_T)$, using naturality of θ , the ribbon property, naturality of σ , and braided commutativity of T .

There is also a formula for the inverse of θ in [9], namely $\theta^{-1}(v) = v_{(0)} \leftarrow S^{-2}(v_{(1)})$. We compute for completeness:

$$\theta \theta^{-1}(v) = \theta(v_{(0)} \leftarrow S^{-2}(v_{(1)})) = \theta(v_{(0)}) \leftarrow v_{(1)} = v_{(0)} \leftarrow S(v_{(1)})v_{(2)} = v$$

and

$$\theta^{-1} \theta(v) = \theta^{-1}(\theta(v)_{(0)}) \otimes S^{-2}(\theta(v)_{(1)}) = \theta(v_{(0)}) \leftarrow v_{(1)} = v_{(0)} \leftarrow S(v_{(1)})v_{(2)}.$$

Our final shortcut is not dependent on any results on ribbon transformations or Miyashita-Ulbrich actions, but rather on bijectivity of the antipode, and its consequence that θ is bijective. The morphism $\mu: T \rightarrow T \otimes T^{\text{op}} \otimes T$ constructed for Theorem 3.2 depends only on the H -comodule algebra structure of H , but does not contain H , so that it surely does not change if we replace the H -comodule structure by the H -comodule structure induced along S^2 . But since $\theta: T \rightarrow T$ is colinear between these two comodule structures, and an algebra isomorphism, it follows that θ also preserves μ , that is, axiom (2.11) holds.

REFERENCES

- [1] BAER, A. Zur Einführung des Scharbegriffs. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 160 (1929), 199–207.
- [2] DOI, Y., AND TAKEUCHI, M. Hopf-Galois extensions of algebras, the Miyashita-Ulbrich action, and Azumaya algebras. *J. Algebra* 121 (1989), 488–516.
- [3] GRUNSPAN, C. Quantum torsors. *preprint* (math.QA/0204280).
- [4] KREIMER, H. F., AND TAKEUCHI, M. Hopf algebras and Galois extensions of an algebra. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* 30 (1981), 675–692.
- [5] MONTGOMERY, S. *Hopf algebras and their actions on rings*, vol. 82 of *CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics*. AMS, Providence, Rhode Island, 1993.
- [6] SCHAUENBURG, P. Hopf Bigalois extensions. *Comm. in Alg* 24 (1996), 3797–3825.
- [7] SCHNEIDER, H.-J. Principal homogeneous spaces for arbitrary Hopf algebras. *Israel J. of Math.* 72 (1990), 167–195.
- [8] SCHNEIDER, H.-J. Representation theory of Hopf-Galois extensions. *Israel J. of Math.* 72 (1990), 196–231.
- [9] SOMMERHÄUSER, Y. Ribbon transformations, integrals, and triangular decompositions. *preprint* (gk-mp-9707/52).
- [10] ULBRICH, K.-H. Galoisweiterungen von nicht-kommutativen Ringen. *Comm. in Alg.* 10 (1982), 655–672.

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT DER UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN, THERESIENSTR. 39, 80333 MÜNCHEN, GERMANY, EMAIL: SCHAUEN@MATHEMATIK.UNI-MUENCHEN.DE